

REMARKS

This is a response to the office action of August 14, 2009. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9, 12-14, 18 and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonemachi in view of JP11-147236 (JP236). The Examiner contends that Yonemachi teaches the claim 1 process except the step of recording data on a control apparatus. The Examiner asserts that JP236 teaches a composite molding process including recording various molding parameters to ensure the quality of a molded composite. Applicants respectfully traverse.

JP236 teaches “molding equipment control section which carries out drive controlling of the injection-molding device which performs skin material insert molding based on a preset value of an initial setting input part, a correcting program storage which stores a correcting program which sets up optimum molding conditions which correct each process condition preset value initialized based on an input value of a quality determining input part which inputs a visual external appearance quality decision result, and a quality determining input part, and prevent damage to a skin material decoration layer under shaping”. JP236 teaches data collection but does not remotely teach or suggest that this data is used in a manner consistent to the present claim Step (c), Step (d) or Step (e).

Moreover, there is no relation of this data to when to inject a coating composition into a mold. JP236 relates to a quality control method that collects quality control data regarding injecting a resin into a skin containing mold. There is no indication that the data is used to determine when to inject a coating into the mold. The Examiner appears to assume that any process that implements a quality control system is substantially the same. This contention is without merit. There is no teaching in either Yonemachi or JP236 that would suggest that data is collected to determine an optimal time to inject a coating composition. In this regard, neither Yonemachi nor JP236 contemplate the complexity of data collection to facilitate the injection of a coating around the in-mold substrate. For example, neither contemplate the conflicting need for compressibility of the substrate for optimal coating flow while avoiding permanent substrate deformation from premature coating injection.

Moreover, the present invention is related to in-mold coating which is a very

different process than injection molding. JP236 is concerned with time of injection of a substrate resin and is not applicable relative to the present invention since there is no motivation to determine an optimal time to inject a coating composition into a mold, as injection molding involves forming a molded article, not coating an article while in the mold. In JP236, the coating (the skin) is present when the article resin is injected. With respect to the "coating composition", JP236 only states that one must insert the skin into the mold.

Referring now to specific differences between JP236 and the subject application, JP236 fails to teach or suggest the step of recording at least one of elapsed time between injecting the molten resin and injecting the coating composition, the pressure of the molding cavity at coating injection, and the temperature in the molding cavity at coating injection. Moreover, JP236 is not an in-mold coating process. Rather, a skin is present when a resin is injected. Since no data concerning in-mold coating is recorded, it cannot be used for quality control purposes or to determine when the coating composition is to be injected into the mold. JP236 teaches determining the melt temperature and injecting the resin composition. The injection time is not based on previously recorded data or parameters concerning an in-mold coating. Moreover, timing is not a factor where the skin is already in the mold, such that the recorded data is not used to determine when the coating composition should be injected into the mold to obtain a quality article.

It would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to employ the recorded data for resin injection in the invention of JP236 and apply the same to in-mold coating. The processes each require different steps, different equipment, different technical concerns, and therefore JP236 does not suggest the present invention as combined with Yonemachi.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims remaining in the application (claims 1, 3-7, 12-14 and 20-23) are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Fay Sharpe LLP



December 14, 2009
Date

Scott A. McCollister, Reg. No. 33,961
The Halle Building, 5th Floor
1228 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1843
216.363.9000

N:\OMNZ\200011\US\GBS0005051V001.docx